

REMARKS

**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended to correct an apparent typographical error, claims 1 and 9 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, and 23 have been amended, and claims 35-40 have been added.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the foregoing amendments and new claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 and 10-40 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:**

In the Office Action at pages 2-4, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 7-10, 15, 19, 21-29, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of Sawada et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/21663). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As a point of clarification, claims 1 and 9 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1 and 9 is deemed moot.

By way of review, Sawada et al. teaches, among other features, a battery pack 22 which includes a reproducing device 23. The battery pack 22 is connectable to and powers a telephone 21. The battery pack 22 further receives a semiconductor memory 3, which is removable as shown in FIGs. 6 and 7. In addition, the battery pack 22 has a jack 25 which outputs audio reproduced by the reproducing device 23 and which is stored as MPEG 3 and ATRAC data on the semiconductor memory 3. (Paragraphs 0050, 0051, 0055; FIGs. 7-9).

However, while the jack 25 is disclosed as outputting reproduced audio through a head receiver 4, there is no suggestion that the jack 25 is able to otherwise power another electronic device. In contrast, claim 2 recites, among other features, "said battery further comprises a primary power connection to connect to said electronic device, and a secondary power output port to connect to another device having a controller to supply current thereto to power the controller." As such, it is respectfully submitted that Sawada et al. does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 2.

For at least similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Sawada et al. does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 10 and 23.

In addition, while Sawada et al. teaches the use of a semiconductor memory 3 for use in

storing data, there is no suggestion that, instead of the semiconductor memory 3, a disk and/or a disk drive should be used. Further, while the Examiner asserts on page 3 that the MPEG 3, ATRAC data in paragraph 0019 corresponds to a disk or disk drive, it is respectfully submitted that Sawada et al. teaches that these files are stored on the memory 3 for reproduction by the reproducing apparatus 23 as described in paragraph 0016. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Sawada et al. does not disclose or suggest, among other features, that "said battery further comprising a memory unit to store information," "wherein the memory unit comprises a disk drive using a disk as a recording medium" as recited in claim 7.

For at least similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Sawada et al. does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 15 and 34.

Claims 8, 19, 21, 22, 24-29 and 33 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from corresponding claims 2, 7, 10, 21, and 23.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:**

In the Office Action at pages 4-5, the Examiner rejects claims 3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Sawada et al. and Cooper (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,448). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner relies on col. 6, lines 30-34, of Cooper as disclosing a communication port, but not as otherwise curing the above noted deficiencies of Sawada et al. as applied to corresponding claims 2 and 10, from which claims 3 and 11 correspondingly depend. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 3 and 11 due at least to the combination not disclosing or suggesting the invention recited in claims 2 and 10.

In the Office Action at pages 5-6, the Examiner rejects claims 4, 5, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Sawada et al., Cooper, and Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,524,122). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner relies on FIGs. 3 and 4 and col. 5, lines 49-55 and col. 7, lines 37-60, of Johnson et al. as disclosing the sliding communication port, but not as otherwise curing the above noted deficiencies of the combination of Sawada et al. and Cooper as applied to corresponding claims 3 and 11, from which claims 4, 5, 12 and 13 correspondingly depend. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 4, 5, 12 and 13 due at least to the combination not disclosing or suggesting the invention recited in claims 3 and 11.

In the Office Action at page 6, the Examiner rejects claims 6 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Sawada et al. and Miyoshi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/44331). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner relies on paragraph 39 of Miyoshi et al. as disclosing a detachable memory unit, but not as otherwise curing the above noted deficiencies of Sawada et al. as applied to corresponding claims 2 and 10, from which claims 6 and 14 correspondingly depend. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 6 and 14 due at least to the combination not disclosing or suggesting the invention recited in claims 2 and 10.

In the Office Action at pages 6-7, the Examiner rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Sawada et al. and Tringali et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,545,891). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner relies on paragraph col. 2, lines 24-27 of Tringali et al. as disclosing a printed circuit board, but not as otherwise curing the above noted deficiencies of the combination of Sawada et al. as applied to claim 10, from which claim 20 depends. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 20 due at least to the combination not disclosing or suggesting the invention recited in claim 10.

In the Office Action at page 7, the Examiner rejects claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Sawada et al. and the Examiner's taking Official Notice of a specific feature. The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Even assuming arguendo that the Official Notice is proper, the Examiner does not rely on the Official Notice as curing the above noted deficiencies of Sawada et al. as applied to claim 23, from which claim 30 depends. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 30 due at least to the combination not disclosing or suggesting the invention recited in claim 23.

#### **PATENTABILITY OF NEW CLAIMS:**

Claims 35-40 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from corresponding claims 2 and 10.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus,

**SERIAL NO. 09/996,737**

**DOCKET NO. 1293.1290**


there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By:   
James G. McEwen  
Registration No. 41,983

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

Date: Nov. 16, 2004